

### REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-3, 5-20, and 22-40 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-8 of the Reply. New claims 41-44 have been added.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner and Primary Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic conference conducted on August 22, 2008, with Keith Drabek. During the conference, Examiner indicated that applicants' representative's proposed amendments appear to overcome the current rejections, but further search would be required.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 18-28, and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-9, 18-28, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0165895) in view of Daniell (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0097174). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.* and Daniell, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims. The claimed subject matter is directed to mitigating accidental or unintentional exposure to offensive content. For example, a content blocking component can be employed to enable a user to preview a message that contains offensive message content in a preview pane, while partially blocking message content in the preview pane to mitigate viewing offensive message content. In one approach, at least words or phrases identified as being potentially offensive can be blocked or removed from the message in the preview pane. In another approach, substantially all of the message content can be blocked from view. (*See* applicants' specification, page 7, lines 12-25). To these ends, independent claim 1, as amended, recites a content blocking component that ***partially blocks content of the at least one message from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a first threshold.***

Rajan *et al.* is directed to an apparatus and method for providing a plurality of appropriately labeled directories that contain e-mails suspected of being spam. To this end, Rajan *et al.* discloses grading the level of spaminess of incoming e-mails and moving or copying the e-mails into one or more of the labeled directories based on an e-mail's respective level of

spaminess. (See Rajan, page 3, paragraphs 27-33). However, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rajan *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a content blocking component that ***partially blocks content of the at least one message from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a first threshold.***

Daniell is directed to systems and methods for managing the detection of undesired email messages. To this end, Daniell discloses mechanisms for detecting and filtering out undesired email messages before the email messages reach a user's inbox. If an incoming email message is determined to contain a word or phrase that has been deemed offensive, then the email message is stored in a spam folder. Once a user selects a spam folder for viewing, identifications of the email messages contained in the spam folder are presented to the user. (See Daniell, pages 1 and 3-4, paragraphs 5, 33, 39, and 43). Although Daniell discloses disabling a preview feature of a selected message when contents in a spam folder are determined to be objectionable or undesired (see Daniell, page 4, paragraph 43), Daniell fails to teach or suggest a content blocking component that ***partially blocks content of the at least one message from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a first threshold.*** Instead, the cited aspects of Daniell disclose blocking the entire content of a selected email associated with a spam folder determined to be objectionable or undesired.

Dependent claim 5, as amended, recites an unblocking component that receives user input ***to unblock the blocked portion of message content of the at least one message in at least the preview pane.*** Applicants' representative respectfully submits that, contrary to assertions made in the Office Action, Daniell fails to disclose or suggest the novel features recited in claim 5. Rather, the cited section discloses moving a message to the inbox to allow a user to read the message, which requires additional steps to allow a user to unblock blocked message content. Further, the operation of Daniell only affects one message per user input, rather than affecting at least one message as recited in claim 5.

Dependent claim 6, as amended, recites ***the unblocking component operates per message.*** Applicants' representative respectfully submits that, contrary to assertions made in the Office Action, Daniell fails to disclose or suggest the novel features recited in claim 6. Rather, the cited section discloses moving a message to the inbox to allow a user to read the message, which requires additional steps to allow a user to unblock blocked message content.

Independent claim 22, as amended, recites *partially blocking message content of the at least one message from appearing in at least the preview pane when the junk score exceeds a blocking threshold*. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rajan *et al.* and Daniell fail to teach or suggest the novel features recited in claim 22. Further, Daniell discloses fully disabling a preview feature of a message associated with objectionable or undesired content.

Dependent claim 27, as amended, recites *unblocking blocked message content of the at least one message when explicit user input to unblock the blocked message content is received*. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that, contrary to assertions made in the Office Action, Daniell fails to disclose or suggest the novel features recited in claim 27. Rather, the cited section discloses moving a message to the inbox to allow a user to read the message, which requires additional steps to allow a user to unblock blocked message content. Further, the operation of Daniell only affects one message per user input, rather than affecting at least one message as recited in claim 27.

Independent claim 34, as amended, recites means for *partially blocking message content of the at least one message from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a blocking threshold*. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rajan *et al.* and Daniell fail to teach or suggest the novel features recited in claim 34. Moreover, Daniell discloses that the entire content of an email message is blocked from appearing in a preview window when associated with objectionable or undesired content.

Independent claim 40, as amended, recites *partially blocking message content of the at least one message from appearing in at least a preview pane when the junk score exceeds a blocking threshold*. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rajan *et al.* and Daniell fail to teach or suggest the novel features recited in claim 40. In addition, Daniell discloses blocking the entire content of a message from appearing in a preview window when associated with objectionable or undesired content. Further, the operation of Daniell only affects one message per user input, rather than affecting at least one message as recited in claim 40.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Rajan *et al.* and Daniell, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every features of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 22, 34, and 40 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection of Claims 10, 34, 38, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 10, 34, 38, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* and Daniell, in view of Dimitrova *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0147782). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Dimitrova *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 10, 34, 38, and 39. In particular, Dimitrova *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* and Daniell with respect to independent claims 1 and 34. Claim 10 properly depends from claim 1, and is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1. Claims 38 and 39 properly depend from claim 34, and are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 34. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**III. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* and Daniell, in view of Adjaoute (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0009495). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Adjaoute, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 11. In particular, Adjaoute does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* and Daniell with respect to independent claim 1. Claim 11 properly depends from claim 1, and is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 12-17 and 30-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* and Daniell, in view of Andrews *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0204569). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Andrews *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 12-17 and 30-33. In particular, Andrews *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* and Daniell with respect to independent claims 1 and 22. Claims 12-17 properly depend from claim 1, and are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1. Claims 30-33 properly depend from claim 22, and are patentable

over the cited are for at least the same reasons as is claim 22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 35-37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Dimitrova *et al.*, in view of Andrews *et al.* This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, Dimitrova *et al.*, and Andrews *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 35-37. In particular, Andrews *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Dimitrova *et al.* with respect to independent claim 34. Claims 35-37 properly depend from claim 34, and are patentable over the cited are for at least the same reasons as is claim 34. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**VI. Rejection of Claim 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* and Daniell, in view of Malik *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0080889). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Malik *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 29. In particular, Malik *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.* and Daniell with respect to independent claim 22. Claim 29 properly depends from claim 22, and is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP644US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/

Keith E. Drabek

Reg. No. 60,757

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731